



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COLH  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,405	02/09/2004	Hiroshi Yoshigi	ASAM.0110	6609
7590	10/05/2005		EXAMINER	
Stanley P. Fisher Reed Smith LLP Suite 1400 3110 Fairview Park Drive Falls Church, VA 22042-4503			BANGACHON, WILLIAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	
			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/773,405	YOSHIGI ET AL.
	Examiner William Bangachon	Art Unit 2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 and 7-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5-6,10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-4 and 7-9, drawn to a series circuit configuration of an RFID tag, classified in class 340, subclass 10.1.
  - II. Claims 5-6 and 10-12, drawn to a parallel circuit configuration of an RFID tag, classified in class 340, subclass 10.1.
2. Inventions II and I are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together because of the different circuit configurations shown in Figures 3-4 (Group I) and Figures 5-6 (Group II), and the equivalent capacitance of Group I, viewed from the antenna coil (page 9, equation 1), is different from the equivalent capacitance of Group II (page 11, equation 2).
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Juan Carlos A. Marquez on 30 September 2005, a provisional election was made **with traverse** to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 5-6 and 10-12. Applicant in replying to this Office action

must make affirmation of this election. Claims 1-4 and 7-9 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2635

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 5-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,608,417 (de Vall) in view of USP 5,517,179 (Charlot, Jr.).

In claims 5 and 6, de Vall teaches of a contactless identification (transponder) comprising:

an antenna coil (Figure 3b, L');

a first capacitor (C');

an IC chip (20) connected to said antenna coil (L') in series through said first capacitor, said first capacitor having a capacitance smaller than an input capacitance of said chip {col. 4, lines 31-35; col. 5, lines 23-27}. Although de Vall do not disclose expressly "said first capacitor smaller than an input capacitance of said chip", these claim limitations would have been a matter of obvious design choice in the system of de Vall, as evidenced by Charlot, Jr. Charlot, Jr., in the same field of endeavor, transponder systems, teach of a presence detection system as shown in Figure 1-3,

have a series resonant circuit L1-C1 and a variable capacitor (varactor) for changing the frequency of the series resonant circuit, depending on a desired frequency of a tag that is being detected. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that depending on the input capacitance of the IC chip (20) of de Vall, the variable capacitor can be varied to be lower than the input capacitance of the IC chip, based on the desired resonant frequency of the tag, as taught by Charlot, Jr.

In claim 10, a contactless identification according to further comprising:

a base as shown in Figure 1, wherein said antenna coil (6) comprises a metallic pattern formed on said base, and any of said capacitors comprises metallic patterns formed on both sides of said base {col. 3, lines 26+}.

In claim 11, a contactless identification according to claim 5, wherein said contactless identification comprises an IC card {col. 1, lines 11+}.

In claim 12, a contactless identification according to claim 5, wherein said contactless identification comprises a portable terminal {col. 7, lines 26-35}. In this case, credit cards are portable.

***Office Contact Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to William Bangachon whose telephone number is **(571)-272-3065**. The Examiner can normally be reached on 4/4/10.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on **(571)-272-3068**. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300** for regular and After Final formal communications. The Examiner's fax number is **(571)-273-3065** for informal communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,405  
Art Unit: 2635

Page 7



William L Bangachon  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2635

October 3, 2005

MICHAEL HORABIK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

